

**General Plan 2020  
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 26, 2001**

---

**Interest Group:**

Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau (Note - unauthorized alternate at this meeting)
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Allison Rolfe	San Diego Audubon (Note - unauthorized alternate at this meeting)
Erik Bruvold	SD Economic Regional Development Corporation
Winston Elton	Save Our Land Values (Note - unauthorized alternate at this meeting)
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club

**Public at Large:**

Philip Parke Troutman	N/A
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Charlene Ayers	N/A
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Jim Peugh	S.D. Audubon
L. Wolfsheimer	N/A
Eric Anderson	Elfin Forest Town Council
Ruth Potter	LWVSD Co.
Paul Gebert	S.D. County Water Authority
Mike Thometz	Merit
Florence Sloane	SDCSD
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Reed Morgan	AIA
Teresa Williamson	National Wildlife Federation
Chris Anderson	S.D. Assn. of Realtors/ Ramona Chamber of Commerce

**County:**

Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)  
Karen Scarborough (Group Facilitator)  
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)  
Aaron Barling (DPLU)  
Elias Barbosa (DPLU)

Tom Harron (County Counsel)

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

### General

Meeting times have now been changed to 11:30am – 2:00pm. Next meeting April 9, 11:30am Tower 7 (brown bag).

### Goals and Policies- Discuss framework of criteria for the new map.

- The goals and policies have been in the making for two years, and have been endorsed in concept by the Board of Supervisors twice- there has been much input in creating this text.
- Suggestion that all of the goals and policies be reexamined one by one, because there are many inconsistencies contained. The group discussed this, and (as recommended by Gary Pryor) the majority agreed to review some minor points of the goals and policies and fine tune them as necessary- but do not attempt to rewrite the entire text.
- Matt Adams outlined the goals and policies that he did not agree with, and there was a lengthy discussion of these:
  - Land Use Goal I, policies F, I, K.
  - Land Use Goal II, policies C, D, E
  - Land Use Goal IV, policies E, G
  - Land Use Goal V, policy I
- Gary agreed that there are some inconsistencies in *Goal II, C and D*- these should definitely be reviewed, the rest of the discrepancies are value judgments.
- Concerns over MSCP, how does it exist in the goals and policies and how will it be implemented.
- The group decided to independently examine the goals and policies and bring any inconsistencies they found (along with solutions) to the next meeting.

### Criteria

- Group shouldn't try to pick concept A,B, or C for the entire county, rather the focus should be to examine each concept itself, and determine if it is applicable. One concept will be applied to each planning area, and the result will be "Alt. D," using a combination of concepts A,B,C.

Concept A- Dan Silver presented the group with changes that he would like to see with "A" and there was a discussion of these proposed changes:

1. *Urban Core* could have a much higher density, 200du/ac and be about half a mile wide.
  2. *Core Support Area* would provide a less-dense support for the urban core, 4 to 10du/ac, about half a mile wide.
  3. *Semi-Rural / Suburban* would have no urban services (i.e. sewer), have small acreage farming, clustering. 1du/2ac to 4du/1ac, about one mile wide.
  4. *Greenbelt* would decrease densities dramatically (1du/40ac and less).
- Concepts and densities should reflect a realistic community, with realistic densities. Each concept should include some flexibility, being able to adjust to the various communities.

### Concept B

- It is too close to concept A, and seems to resemble what we have today.
- Category of "Estate 2" should be removed.
- It appears to create urban sprawl.
- We should recognize infrastructure needs, and market realities.
- It may promote major infill to San Diego from communities that are somewhat close to the city.

### General notes

- The Steering Committee is still concerned about specific financial statements of the Interest Group.

- Possibility of taking a Saturday “field trip” to the communities to observe the actual areas being discussed.

#### Overview of the Steering Committee Meeting (3/26/01)

- Discussion of GP 2020 Goals and Policies.
- Explanation of concepts (A and B).
- Financial Statement request to the Board of Supervisors

#### Public Comments

- There is a new group that has formed in the east county called “Peoples Union for 2020”
- Make a pure concept that has a vision for the county and reduces sprawl
- The Interest Group should know the reality of the back country. The concepts should be valid for the communities. One size does not fit all so the concepts need a reality check.
- May need a community tour.
- Alternative 3 was not supported by the landowners. If the county tries to downzone it will not be supported. Show results that concepts A, B, or C are better than today.